EXHIBIT D

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 1753-4 Filed 04/29/16 Page 2 of 4 Highly Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only

```
1
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
               NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
 3
                    SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
 4
 5
     ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,
 6
 7
                     Plaintiff, )
 8
                                ) No. CV 10-03561
              vs.
 9
     GOOGLE, INC.,
                                )
10
                    Defendant. )
11
12
13
          HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
14
15
          Videotaped Deposition of TIM LINDHOLM, taken
16
          at 333 Twin Dolphin Drive, Redwood Shores,
17
          California, commencing at 9:56 a.m., Wednesday,
18
          September 7, 2011, before Ashley Soevyn,
19
          CSR No. 12019.
20
21
22
23
24
     PAGES 1 - 115
25
                                                      Page 1
```

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 1753-4 Filed 04/29/16 Page 3 of 4 Highly Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only

1 preserve TCK implementation revenue" -- 1 price

- 2 A. Uh-huh.
- 3 Q. -- "defend franchise against fragmentation,
- 4 which is the main threat for long-term erosion."
- 5 Did you write that?
- 6 A. I don't remember writing it, but it
- 7 sounds -- it's in this e-mail.
- 8 Q. So that was what you understood to be one
- 9 of Allen's motivations in the negotiation,
- 10 correct?
- 11 MS. ANDERSON: Objection, form.
- 12 THE WITNESS: So I don't remember writing
- 13 this. And I will point out that I'm saying, "Allen
- 14 presumably wants", so I think I was speculating
- 15 even -- even -- even back then, as to what Allen --
- 16 what Allen's considerations were.
- 17 BY MR. NORTON:
- 18 Q. But when you wrote an e-mail to Mr. Rubin
- 19 and Mr. Minor, talking about Sun and things to keep
- 20 in mind, you would have given your best
- 21 understanding of Sun's perspective, wouldn't you?
- MR. LISI: Objection, form.
- 23 MS. ANDERSON: Objection, form.
- 24 THE WITNESS: I think what I would write
- 25 depends on the context on which it was written. If
 - Page 98
- 1 I dashed something off or if I -- and I don't recall
- 2 the context in which this was written at all, so I3 can't really vouch for the quality of the opinions.
- 4 BY MR. NORTON:
- 5 Q. But these are the opinions you expressed to
- 6 Mr. Rubin at the time?
- 7 A. This is the e-mail that I apparently
- 8 wrote.
- 9 Q. All right. And in the e-mail that you
- 10 wrote, you also wrote in the same paragraph, but
- 11 towards the end, last sentence reads, "We do not
- 12 want to turn this into a negotiation for buying the
- 13 Java franchise itself with Sun, even compensating
- 14 for the risk of its loss". While Sun probably --
- 15 A. Which paragraph are we?
- 16 Q. It's in the same paragraph the way it
- 17 begins, "Allen, presumably". But I'm now reading
- 18 the last two sentences to you.
- 19 A. Okay, I'm going to get something to be able
- 20 to track that. I write long sentences. Okay.
- 21 Okay. I see that now. I see --
- Q. And you wrote, "We do not want to turn this
- 23 into a negotiation for buying the Java franchise
- 24 itself from Sun, even compensating for the risk of
- 25 loss. While Sun probably will contemplate that, the

- 1 price would be high." Did you write that?
- 2 A. Again, it's in this e-mail.
- 3 Q. Was that your view at the time?
- 4 A. I don't -- I don't actually remember what
- 5 my -- I don't remember the details of my view at the
- 7 Q. Did you try to figure out what the price
- 8 would be?
- MS. ANDERSON: Objection, form.
- 10 THE WITNESS: Definitely not. I -- I -- I
- 11 don't have any background in doing that sort of
- 12 thing. This is an engineer's speculating, if
- 13 anything.
- MR. NORTON: Let's mark Exhibit 532.
- 15 (Exhibit 532 marked for identification.)
- MS. ANDERSON: State on the record that
- 17 Exhibit 532 is a document with respect to which
- 18 Google has objected as being privileged on
- 19 attorney-client, work product grounds. Objected to
- 20 its production, but was compelled under court order
- 21 to produce this document because the Court had
- 22 concluded that an order of the document was not
- 23 subject to privilege. This is an issue that is --
- 24 that Google continues to object to and reserves all
- 25 rights on appeal with respect to that ruling. And,

Page 100

- 1 therefore, we understand it's being marked in this
- 2 deposition pursuant to the fact that the Court had
- 3 issued that order, but we want to restate our
- 4 objections here, given the importance of this issue
- 5 to Google.
- 6 THE WITNESS: Do I get that note back?
- 7 MS. ANDERSON: And while I'm -- I also want
- 8 to say, I just want to make sure, this transcript
- 9 needs to be designated highly confidential under the
- 10 terms of the protective order, until we've had a
- 11 chance to do other designations, that's it.
- 12 MR. NORTON: Okay.
- MS. ANDERSON: Okay. That's it.
- 14 BY MR. NORTON:
- 15 Q. Mr. Lindholm --
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. -- you've seen Exhibit 532 before?
- 18 A. Yes, I have.
- 19 Q. It's an e-mail from you to Mr. Rubin,
- 20 Mr. Grove, Mr. Lee, and Mr. -- and yourself,
- 21 correct?
- A. Well, specifically, it's to Andy and Ben
- 23 Lee, cc'd to Dan and myself.
- Q. And you see the body of the e-mail?
- A. I do see the body of the e-mail.

Page 101

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 1753-4 Filed 04/29/16 Page 4 of 4 Highly Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only

1 Q. You sent this e-mail on August 6, 2010; is 1 were no -- there were no investigations. 2 that right? 2 BY MR. NORTON: 3 A. I believe that to be true. 3 Q. For the record, my question was not so 4 Q. Would you please begin reading at, "Hi, 4 limited. When you wrote, "We've been over a bunch 5 Andy." And read the entire e-mail out loud for the 5 of these and think they all suck". Who thought 6 record. 6 "they all sucked"? MS. ANDERSON: Objection. We state all of MS. ANDERSON: Objection, form. And also 8 our objections and preserve our right on appeal. 8 caution the witness and instruct him not to answer 9 You may read the face of this e-mail. 9 to the extent responding to the question would THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, can I begin with 10 require you to reveal a separate communication with 11 "Attorney work product, Google confidential", which 11 Google counsel or require you to reveal work you did 12 is also in the e-mail. And it goes, "Hi, Andy, this 12 at the direction of Google counsel, as part of the 13 is a short pre-read for the call at 12:30. In Dan's 13 investigation. 14 earlier e-mail, he didn't give you a lot of context THE WITNESS: So -- so the we -- the going 15 for the visceral reaction that we got. What we have 15 over what we thought about them was entirely done on 16 actually been asked to do by Larry and Sergei, is to 16 the direction of Google counsel. There was no such 17 investigate what technical alternatives exist to 17 work being done independently, not being done under 18 Java, or Android and Chrome. We've been over a 18 the direction of counsel. So I don't think I can 19 bunch of these and think that they all suck. Think 19 answer anything there. 20 they all suck. We conclude that we need to 20 BY MR. NORTON: 21 negotiate a license for Java under the terms we Q. What were the specific alternatives that 22 need. That said, Allen Eustace said that the threat 22 you have investigated for Android? 23 of moving off Java hit Safra Katz hard. We think MS. ANDERSON: Objection, form. And also 24 there's value in the negotiation to put forward a 24 objection on the basis of attorney-client, 25 most credible alternative, the goal being to get 25 work-product privilege. To the extent responding to Page 102 Page 104 1 better terms and price for Java. It looks to us 1 this question would require you to reveal 2 that Obj-C provides the most credible alternative in 2 communications with Google counsel in confidence or 3 this context, which should not be confused with us 3 work done under the direction of Google counsel, I 4 thinking we should make the change. What we're 4 instruct you not to answer on the grounds of 5 looking for from you are reasons why you hate this 5 privilege. 6 idea, whether you think this is a nonstarter for THE WITNESS: Once again, the work we --7 negotiation purposes and whether you think there is 7 the work we did on this was entirely done under the 8 anything we missed in our understanding of the 8 direction of counsel. There was no work done 9 option. Tim and Dan". 9 outside of that or for any other purpose, so I 10 Q. Thank you. So when you wrote, "We've been 10 cannot answer that question either. 11 asked to investigate what technical alternatives 11 BY MR. NORTON: 12 exist for Java and Android and Chrome, can you tell 12 Q. What were the technical alternatives you 13 me what technical alternatives you looked at? 13 investigated to Java for Chrome? MS. ANDERSON: Objection. Instruct the 14 MS. ANDERSON: Objection, form. Also 15 witness not to answer on the grounds of 15 object on the basis attorney-client, work-product 16 attorney-client privilege or work product to the 16 privilege. Instruct the witness not to answer to 17 extent responding to the question requires you to 17 the extent responding would require you to reveal 18 reveal work that you did at the direction of counsel 18 communications with Google's counsel in confidence 19 or communications you had with counsel for Google in 19 or work that you did at the direction of Google. 20 confidence. 20 THE WITNESS: Again, the work that we did THE WITNESS: So the investigation and the 21 relating to Chrome was entirely done under the 22 technical alternatives was strictly done on the 22 direction of counsel and was work product. We -- we 23 request of counsel, was done with the understanding 23 did no such work outside of direction of counsel on 24 of the work product. So outside of -- outside of 24 alternatives to Chrome. 25 BY MR. NORTON: 25 those things covered by -- by that situation, there Page 103 Page 105